

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 20, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 and 45-53 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-20 and 45-53 stand rejected. Claims 21-44 and 54-63 have been canceled without prejudice.

The rejection of Claims 1-20 and 45-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Claim 1 is “incomplete for omitting an essential step, such an omission amounting to a gap between the steps.” Applicants traverse this assertion. Applicants have amended Claim 1 as suggested in the Office Action to address this rejection. For example, Claim 1 recites, among other things, “prompting a customer to provide information related to at least one financing requirement....” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 1 is complete in describing the steps of the invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection to Claim 1.

The Office Action also asserts that Claim 2 is “not a positive recitation in the claim.” Applicants traverse this assertion. Applicants have amended Claim 2 as suggested in the Office Action to address this rejection. For example, Claim 2 recites, among other things, “evaluating by the computer a financing type selected by the customer....” Claims 3, 2, 13, and 47 have been amended to include similar recitations. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, and 47 definite and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection to Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, and 47.

Additionally, Office Action asserts that Claim 11 is unclear as to “whether there is one financing requirement or more than one financing requirement.” Applicants traverse this assertion. Applicants have amended Claim 11 to address this rejection as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action. For example, Claim 11 recites, among other things, “prompt a customer to provide information related to at least one financing requirement . . . prompt the customer to input responses to a plurality of questions regarding the at least one requirement for financing the energy-related asset....” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 11 definite and distinctly claims the subject matter of the invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection to Claim 11.

The Office Action also asserts that Claim 45 is unclear as to “whether Applicants mean ‘regarding a requirement for financing ...’ or ‘regarding requirements for financing’” Moreover, the Office Action asserts that Claim 45 should include the limitation “means for prompting a customer to provide information related to a financing requirement” in order to be in agreement with Claims 1 and 11. Applicants traverse these assertions. Applicants have amended Claim 45 to address this rejection according to the suggestions offered by the Examiner in the Office Action. For example, Claim 45 recites, among other things, “means for prompting a customer to provide information related to at least one financing requirement . . . means for prompting the customer to input responses to a plurality of questions regarding the at least one requirement for financing the energy-related asset....” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 45 definite and distinctly claims the subject matter of the invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection to Claim 45.

Furthermore, Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 46-53 have been rejected because they depend from a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 46-53 depend from independent Claims 1, 11, and 45. When the recitations of Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 46-53 are considered with the recitations of Claims 1, 11, and 45,

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 46-53 likewise satisfy Section 112, second paragraph.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection to Claims 1-20 and 45-53.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel M. Fitzgerald
Registration No. 38,880
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070